



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,349	03/26/2004	Jerome Asius	22114-00001-US1	7560
30678	7590	12/18/2007	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			PREBILIC, PAUL B	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1100			3774	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/809,349	ASIUS ET AL.
	Examiner Paul B. Prebilic	Art Unit 3774

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.


 Paul B. Prebilic
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 3774

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is unpersuasive. Applicant argues that Sander is not a gel based upon file wrapper estoppel in a parent application. However, this application is distinct from the parent application and the file wrapper estoppel thereof has not been incorporated into the present application. Furthermore, in the present application, the Applicant argues that gels merely "can" be defined the same way that they were defined in the parent application; see the third paragraph on page 2 of the response. It is clear from this statement that the Applicant does not consider the term "gel" as necessarily limited to the extent that it was in the parent application. Additionally, most of the present claims do not utilize the term "gel" but rather utilize the term "hydrogel precursor". Moreover, the claims have a much broader scope than that of the claims of the patented parent application. Additionally, Sander discloses a "gel" as one form of this device so the argument that Sander does not disclose a "gel" is misplaced; see column 2, lines 35-56. The Applicant also argues that the Sander material is not "reconstitutable" as claimed. However, upon reviewing column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 32, it is clear to the Examiner that a reconstitution process is being described in that the material is wetted to form a workable material. The Applicant also argues that "the material of Sander after being implanted is to be shaped such as with a spatula and once it is dried it will harden." However, Sander states the contrary in the passage from column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 32 where he says that it "will not set into a rock hard material like plaster of paris which, when wetted, begins to set and lose workability within five to ten minutes. Therefore, the composition of the present invention retains workability or moldability characteristics for an extended period of time after being wetted, resulting in improved overall handling characteristics for an extended period of time after being wetted." It is not clear how the material will be dried when it within the body surrounded by bodily fluids. For these reasons and more, the rejections have been maintained.